

Web address with a precise target date. The disclosed Web browser can optionally include a mechanism to facilitate the specification of the desired date and time, or the user can manually append the time stamp to the URL indicated in the "Location" window of the browser. The persistent Web servers (i) receive URLs containing a time stamp, (ii) 5 extract the time stamp, (iii) retrieve the correct Web page from the archive, and (iv) return the requested page to the client. The persistent Web servers include a persistent archive for storing all of the versions of Web resources that will be persistently available to Web users.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22 and 28

10 Independent claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingrassia in view of Bohannon.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Ingrassia discloses a method that receives a request that includes a time-stamp (citing column 7, lines 30-38 and 57-65) and identifying as a function of the time-stamp a machine storing a version of the 15 electronic document for a time period corresponding to the time-stamp. (citing column 8, lines 9-22). The Examiner acknowledges that Ingrassia did not teach "transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine," but asserts that Bohannon discloses this limitation.

Applicants note that Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest "receiving a 20 request for an electronic document that includes a time-stamp indicating a *creation time* of a desired version of a multiple-version document," as required by each of the independent claims of the present invention. Rather, Ingrassia's time-stamps identify when a given electronic document is *loaded or unloaded* by a given browser with the *same version* of a document having *multiple time-stamps*. (Col. 7, line 59; Col. 8, lines 25 16 and 42. See also, Col. 19, line 61).

In addition, Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest "identifying as a function of the time-stamp, a machine storing a version of said electronic document for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp," as further required by each of the independent claims of the present invention.

The Examiner also asserts that Bohannon teaches “transmitting the electronic document corresponding to the requested time-stamp from the identified machine (col. 4, lines 64-67, and col. 5, lines 1-18).”

Applicants note that Bohannon et al. is directed to a database management system, and in particular, to techniques for aging versions of data records for deletion purposes to increase memory capacity. While Bohannon assigns time stamps to data records in a database, it is for the purpose of deleting records having multiple versions in response to the time stamp. The time stamping appears to be an internal, transparent process initiated by the Bohannon system upon an update to an existing data record.

10 There is no suggestion that such time stamps are even provided or known to the user and there certainly is no suggestion that such time stamps are employed in a *user request* for a data record to identify a particular version.

Independent claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22, and 28 require receiving a request for an electronic document that includes a time-stamp indicating a *creation time* of a desired version of a multiple-version document and require transmitting the electronic document from said identified machine or transmitting an indication of said identified machine corresponding to the requested time-stamp.

Thus, Ingrassia and Bohannon, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest receiving a request for an electronic document that includes a time-stamp indicating a *creation time* of a desired version of a multiple-version document and require transmitting the electronic document from said identified machine or transmitting an indication of said identified machine corresponding to the requested time-stamp, as required by independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 28.

Bohannon et al. is also directed to the non-analogous field of a database management system that employs techniques for *aging* versions of data records for *deletion* purposes to increase memory capacity. The present invention is not interested in deleting any version of a multiple version document, but rather, in maintaining such multiple versions and making them accessible to a user. The present invention provides a convenient mechanism for a user to uniquely identify a particular one of such multiple versions. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art of the present invention would not

look to Bohannon et al. for a solution to the problem of supplementing an address (or file name) so that it differentiates versions of a multiple version document.

Dependent Claims

5 Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-14, 17-21 and 23-27 were also again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ingrassia, Jr. et al. in view of Bohannon et al. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 17-21 and 23-27 are dependent on Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22 or 28 and are therefore patentably distinguished over Ingrassia because of their dependency from amended independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 16, 22 or 28, for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

10 In view of the foregoing, the invention, as claimed in Claims 1 through 28, cannot be said to be either taught or suggested by Ingrassia, Jr. et al. and Bohannon et al., alone or in combination. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 through 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

15 All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 28, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

20

Respectfully submitted,



Date: May 28, 2003

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

25